



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. 31

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN NJ 07962-2245

COPY MAILED

FEB 22 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Jiandong Hunag et al.	:	
Application No. 09/513,010	:	
Filed: February 25, 2000	:	DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION
Attorney Docket Number: H16-26156 US	:	UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.137(B)
Title: MULTIPLE NETWORK FAULT	:	
TOLERANCE VIA REDUNDANT	:	
NETWORK CONTROL	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed February 16, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)¹, to revive the above-identified application.

The above-identified application became abandoned due to the January 14, 2005 decision of the Board for Patent Appeals and Interferences which upheld the Examiner's rejections. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on March 15, 2005, the expiration of the period for seeking judicial review of this decision². A notice of abandonment was mailed on April 8, 2005.

A petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) was filed on July 5, 2005, along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), the appropriate fee, and a preliminary amendment. The petition was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on October 11, 2005 for failure to establish that the

¹ A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(m);
- (3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

² See MPEP § 1216.

entire period of delay was unavoidable, and for failure to submit a terminal disclaimer, pursuant to MPEP §711.03(c)II(G).

Along with the original petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), filed on December 15, 2005, Petitioner submitted the petition fee, the proper statement of unintentional delay, a terminal disclaimer, and the fee associated with the filing of the same. This petition was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on January 23, 2006, for failure to submit an acceptable terminal disclaimer.

With this renewed petition, the deficiency has been rectified. As such, the petition is **GRANTED**.

After the mailing of this decision, the application will be forwarded to Technology Center 2100 for further processing.

It is noted that with this renewed petition, Petitioner has submitted the petition fee and the fee associated with the filing of a terminal disclaimer. As these fees were submitted with the original petition, these payments are not required, and they will be refunded to Petitioner's Deposit Account, as authorized in the renewed petition.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



Paul Shanowski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office